

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

DOUGLAS J. JOHNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 21-10437
Hon. George Caram Steeh

EAST TAWAS HOUSING
COMMISSION, *et al.*,

Defendants.

_____ /

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS AND ENJOINING
FURTHER FILINGS WITHOUT COURT PERMISSION

The court summarily dismissed Plaintiff's complaint on March 19, 2021. The Sixth Circuit affirmed the dismissal on November 9, 2021. Since this final adjudication, Plaintiff has filed six repetitive motions re-arguing issues that have been resolved by the court and/or seeking to disqualify the undersigned judge. Plaintiff's filings are duplicative, frivolous, and vexatious, misusing the court's limited time and resources. Plaintiff's most recent motions (ECF Nos. 22, 23) are DENIED for the reasons set forth in the court's previous orders. See ECF Nos. 15, 17, 19, 21.

It appears that Plaintiff seeks relief from Chief Judge Cox, complaining about the undersigned pursuant to the Judicial Conduct and Disability Act, 28 U.S.C. § 351, *et seq.* Such complaints are to be filed with

the Clerk of the Court for the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals.¹ *Id.* However, the court notes that the “judicial misconduct system is emphatically not a forum for disappointed litigants to continue litigation already decided on the merits,” which is Plaintiff’s approach here. *In re Judicial Misconduct*, 579 F.3d 1062, 1064 (9th Cir. 2009).

In light of Plaintiff’s repetitive and frivolous filings, the court will enjoin Plaintiff from filing any further motions or requests for relief in this lawsuit, which is closed, without permission from the court. *See Feathers v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 141 F.3d 264, 269 (6th Cir. 1998) (“There is nothing unusual about imposing prefiling restrictions in matters with a history of repetitive or vexatious litigation.”); *Filipas v. Lemons*, 835 F.2d 1145, 1146 (6th Cir. 1987). Plaintiff may not evade this requirement by filing a new lawsuit based upon the same facts or arguments.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff is ENJOINED from filing any further documents in Case No. 21-10437 without leave of court.

¹ “Any person alleging that a judge has engaged in conduct prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts, or alleging that such judge is unable to discharge all the duties of office by reason of mental or physical disability, may file with the clerk of the court of appeals for the circuit a written complaint containing a brief statement of the facts constituting such conduct.” 28 U.S.C. § 351.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff is ENJOINED from filing new lawsuits in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan that seek to relitigate the same facts, issues, and arguments raised in Case No. 21-10437 without initially seeking leave of court.

To obtain leave to file any further documents or lawsuits, Plaintiff must initially comply with all of the following requirements:

1. He must file a “Motion Pursuant to Court Order Seeking Leave to File” with any proposed motion, request, or lawsuit; and
2. As an exhibit to that motion, he must attach a declaration prepared pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746 or a sworn affidavit certifying that the document he wishes to present is a new issue that has never been raised by him in court.

The Clerk’s Office is directed to reject any filings that do not comply with these conditions. Compliance with these terms does not, in itself, constitute grounds for granting leave to file.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 28, 2022

s/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on September 28, 2022, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also on Douglas J. Johnson, 3325 Grange Hall Rd., Apt. 204, Holly, MI 48442.

s/Brianna Sauve
Deputy Clerk